

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, 8, 13, 15-17, 20 and 25 have been amended. Claims 1-9, 13-21, 25 and 26 are pending. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original and other claims in this and in other applications.

The drawings stand objected to. The Specification has been amended to conform with the drawings.

Claims 1, 3-5, 8, 13, 15-17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements or for being indefinite. The claims have been amended, pursuant to the Examiner's suggestion, to overcome the rejection. Therefore, claims 1, 3-5, 8, 13, 15-17 and 20 should be allowable.

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 25 has been amended to include the limitation "computer program recorded in a computer readable medium." Therefore, claim 25 should be allowable.

Claims 1, 3, 7, 13, 15, 19, 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2003/0050927 ("Hussam").

The apparatus of claim 1 has "[a] document output unit [which] determines a manner in which . . . retrieval keywords are highlighted in [a] presented [document] in accordance with a feature index indicating an extent to which each of the retrieval keywords has contributed to the selection of the documents." The output unit highlights the retrieval keywords in the presented document "in the determined manner." These are important features of the invention.

The Office Action contends that Hussam discloses all of the limitations of claim 1. (Office Action, pp. 7-8) Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited portions of Hussam only disclose that Hussam's Semantic Highlighting Information Retrieval Engine builds color-coded legend of search terms, displays the total number of hits per term, and displays the search terms with color-coded highlighting. Hussam, however, fails to disclose the "extent to which each of the retrieval keywords has contributed to the selection of the documents." *See* Specification, page 15, line 10+. For at least these reasons, claim 1 should be allowable.

Claims 3, 7, 13, 15, 19, 25 and 26 depend from claim 1 or contain similar limitations as claim 1. For at least the reasons mentioned above, claims 3, 7, 13, 15, 19, 25 and 26 should be allowable.

Claims 8, 9, 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2004/0034629 ("Genser").

Claim 8 says the document retrieval apparatus has a document output unit that "determine[es] a manner in which the retrieval keywords are highlighted based on an extent to which each of the retrieval keywords has contributed to document selection" Genser is directed to a system and method for organizing database search criteria match results which are generated through a search engine. The Genser system provides interactive display control of information using different methods of emphasis, de-emphasis and designation by manipulating attributes such as size, color, style, highlight and background presentation. But Genser fails to disclose at least the above limitations of claim 8. Therefore, claim 8 should be allowable.

Claims 9, 20 and 21 depend from claim 8 or contain similar limitations as claim 8. Therefore, claims 9, 20 and 21 should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 8.

Claims 2 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hussam and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,787,421 ("Nomiyaama").

Claim 2 depends from claim 1, and claim 14 depends from claim 13. As mentioned earlier, Hussam fails to disclose all of the limitations of claims 1 and 13. The Office Action relies on Nomiyaama as only disclosing collecting data on keywords contained in the documents retrieved by the keyword retrieval engine. (Office Action, p.14) Because the Hussam and Nomiyaama combination fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1 or 13, claims 2 and 14 should be allowable.

Claims 4 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hussam and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,094,651 ("Agrawal").

Claim 4 depends from claim 1, and claim 16 depends from claim 13. As mentioned earlier, Hussam fails to disclose all of the limitations of claims 1 and 13. The Office Action relies on Agrawal as only disclosing relative intensity of highlighting in terms of colors. (Office Action, pp. 16-17) Because the Hussam and Agrawal combination fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1 or 13, claims 4 and 16 should be allowable.

Claims 5, 6, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hussam and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0175036 ("Graham").

Claims 5 and 6 depend from claim 1, and claims 17 and 18 depend from claim 13. As mentioned earlier, Hussam fails to disclose all of the limitations of claims 1 and 13. The

Office Action relies on Graham as only disclosing highlighting terms including using different font sizes instead of colors to highlight text. (Office Action, pp. 18-19) Because the Hussam and Graham combination fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1 or 13, claims 5, 6, 17 and 18 should be allowable.

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: March 10, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By

Mark J. Thronson

Registration No.: 33,082

Ranga Sourirajan

Registration No.: 60,109

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street, NW

Washington, DC 20006-5403

(202) 420-2200

Attorneys for Applicant